



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,695	08/24/2001	Tooru Ooiwa	P 280363 57325-US-SuS/nh	9654
909	7590	11/06/2003	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102			SCHEUERMANN, DAVID W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2834	

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/935,695	OOIWA, TOORU
Examiner	Art Unit	
David W. Scheuermann	2834	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication app appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2003 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4,5,8-11 and 13-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,4,5,8-11 and 13-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on November 21, 2001 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. The distinction between a "regular segment" and an "irregular segment" remains unclear; hence the 112 rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The line of demarcation separating the "regular segment" form the "irregular segment" is not clear.

Because the specification does not, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms define the invention and differentiate which portions of the stator winding constitute "regular segments" and which constitute "irregular segments" a person skilled in the art would not be able to build the invention as envisioned by the applicant.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The meets and bounds of the terms "regular segments" and "irregular segments" are not clear. It is not clear where a "regular segments" ends and an "irregular segments" begins. It is not clear how to distinguish a regular segment from and irregular segment, hence the claims fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, and 11, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmidt et al., US 5712517. Schmidt et al. shows a rotary electric machine having a rotor (inherent), stator see figure 1 and 2, having an irregular segment (the segment having stator lead wire 36' extending therefrom which also includes the winding which extends axially around both ends of the stator) around which insulator sleeve 80 is attached, and a plurality of regular segments as shown in figure 1 consisting of those segments which do not have stator leads extending therefrom to terminal plate 50. It is inherent that all the segments are insulated. Insulation sleeve 80 forms a second insulating layer.

Re claim 5, as best understood, the fan is not shown as described in column 2, lines 63-64.

Re claims 8 and 11, as best understood, it appears that insulation sleeve 80 of different material than the inherent segment insulation and that the insulation material is thicker, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt et al. in view of Hake et al., US 5917155. Schmidt et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed as set forth in the rejection of claim 1 supra. Schmidt et al. do not expressly disclose the specific material used to form the insulation. Hake et al. disclose polyester-imide forming an inner insulation and polyamide-imide forming an outer insulation as set forth in claims 10 and 15, for the purpose of forming "a multilayer insulation system which is highly resistant to corona discharge," see column 1, lines 51-53. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to insulate the stator sectors (both regular and irregular) of Schmidt et al. with polyester-imide forming an inner insulation and polyamide-imide forming an outer insulation as taught by Hake et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this make the motor sector windings resistant to corona discharge.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt et al. in view of Umeda et al., US 5936326. Schmidt et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed as set forth in the rejection of claim 1 supra. Schmidt et al. do not expressly disclose a rectifier and cooling fan at opposite axial ends. Umeda et al.

disclose fans 33 at opposite ends of a rotor and locating rectifier at an axial end for the purpose of improving cooling performance as set forth in the first sentence of the abstract. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use dual fans, one at each end of the rotor and consolidate the rectifier at an axial end near the cooling fan as taught by Umeda et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to remarkably improve cooling performance.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David W. Scheuermann whose telephone number is (703) 308-9637. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2834

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Dws
November 3, 2003



**Nicholas Ponomarenko
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800**